

>>
>> 1) The raw response rates differ slightly - e.g., 15% vs. 17%.
>> John does not know why this is the case.
>> 2) Significance Testing. The LWG used the biostats software. He
>> indicated that this is a complicated procedure but that the LWG
>> followed the decision tree associated with the software package
>> and did not make any choices that were inconsistent with the
>> decision tree.
>> 3) The calculation of the level of the hit (e.g., low, moderate
>> or severe toxicity) based on a comparison to the reference
>> envelope was based on an added 10% to the reference envelop
>> opposed to multiplying by the reference envelope value by 1.1 or
>> 1.2.

>>
>> I would like to set up a time to discuss this sometime this week.
>> Please let me know when you might be available. I will work with
>> John to hopefully have some information that we can use to focus
>> the discussion.

>>
>> Thanks, Eric,
>>
>>

>> --
>> Jay Field
>> Assessment and Restoration Division
>> Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA
>> 7600 Sand Point Way NE
>> Seattle, WA 98115-6349
>> (P) 206-526-6404
>> (F) 206-526-6865
>> (E) jay.field@noaa.gov
>>
>>
>>
>

--
Jay Field
Assessment and Restoration Division
Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA
7600 Sand Point Way NE
Seattle, WA 98115-6349
(P) 206-526-6404
(F) 206-526-6865
(E) jay.field@noaa.gov